

Supplemental Rubric for 2006-2007 Title II, Part B Mathematics and Science Partnership Competitive Grant  
Previously Funded Partnership Projects: Lessons Learned

**1. Assessment of Accomplishments of Previously Funded MSP Projects:**

The Assessment of Accomplishments should describe the goals and objectives of the previously funded MSP project, provide specific evidence of achievement of these goals and objectives, and indicate lessons learned as a result of these efforts.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds Standard</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
1a. Description of the previously funded MSP project's goals and objectives	<b>See Meets Standard</b>	<b>3 points</b> Provides specific and clear details of the goals and objectives of the previously funded project, and lessons learned from this project. Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.	<b>0 points</b> Provides insufficient details of the goals and objectives of the previously funded project or does not include lessons learned from this project.
1b. Activities were linked to goals and objectives of proposal	<b>10 points</b> Provides specific and clear evidence that shows how activities were linked to the goals and objectives stated in the project and the data provided by the needs assessment. This evidence must include the impact of the professional development activities on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.	<b>8 points</b> Evidence is provided that activities supported achievement of the goals and objectives. This evidence must include the impact of the professional development activities on student achievement and teacher effectiveness. Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.	<b>0 points</b> Little or no correlation was made between the activities and achievement of the project's goals or objectives.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds Standard</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
1c. Description and timeline of professional development activities	<b>See Meets Standard</b>	<b>4 points</b> Includes a clear and detailed description and timeline of all the delivered professional development activities including the number, types, duration, intensity and responsible partner. Reflection addresses whether the proposed timeline was realistic and appropriate, including any modifications that were implemented, and the impact on future planning.	<b>0 points</b> Includes an incomplete description and/or timeline.

Criteria	Exceeds Standard	Meets Standard	Below Standard
1d. Professional development activities included critical design elements	See Meets Standard	<p><b>12 points</b></p> <p>Provides clear and specific evidence that the delivered professional development activities included each of these critical design elements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment to the targeted Arizona Mathematics or Science Standards and Arizona Professional Teaching Standards;</li> <li>• Work-embedded application of new learning, continuous reflection, and ongoing support;</li> <li>• Rigorous and challenging academic content and the development of pedagogical content knowledge;</li> <li>• Learn the content, Reinforce the content learning, Consolidate the learning, and Implement the content.</li> </ul> <p>Describe any changes in these areas you would implement for future projects.</p> <p>Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Does not provide sufficient evidence describing how the delivered professional development activities addressed each of the critical design elements.</p>

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds Standard</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
1e. Strengths and weaknesses of experimental design and evaluation plan.	<b>See Meets Standard</b>	<b>6 points</b> Reflects on the strengths and weaknesses of the experimental design and evaluation plan developed for the previously funded MSP project. Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.	<b>0 points</b> Reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the experimental design or evaluation plan developed for the previously funded MSP project was inadequate.
1f. Contribution to research	<b>See Meets Standard</b>	<b>3 points</b> Clearly articulates how the delivered activities help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, and usable body of findings.	<b>0 points</b> Reflection inadequately articulates how the delivered activities help the MSP Program build a rigorous, cumulative, reproducible, or usable body of findings.

## **2. Commitment and Capacity of Partnership:**

The project reflection must clearly demonstrate the submitting partnership had the capability of managing the project, organizing the work and meeting deadlines.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Exceeds Standard</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
2a. Duties and responsibilities related to the goals and objectives of the project	<b>8 points</b> Detailed evidence of how the duties and responsibilities of each partner contributed to the goals and objectives of the proposal. is provided.	<b>6 points</b> General description of how the duties and responsibilities of each partner contributed to the goals and objectives of the proposal is provided.	<b>0 points</b> Inadequate information on the duties and responsibilities of each partner is provided.
2b. Partnership governance	<b>4 points</b> Detailed evidence of the partnership's governing structure specific to each partner's role in decision-making, communication, and fiscal responsibilities, including a reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the governance structure is provided.	<b>3 points</b> General description of the partnership's governing structure specific to each partner's role in decision-making, communication, and fiscal responsibilities, including a reflection on the strengths and weaknesses of the governance structure is provided.	<b>0 points</b> Inadequate information is provided related to partnership governance or did not include a reflection on strengths and weaknesses of governance structure.
2c. Sustainability	<b>See Meets Standard</b>	<b>3 points</b> Describes in detail how the MSP funded project was continued after funding expired, including how assessment data was used, how the project was promoted within the school and/or school districts, and how obstacles to funding were overcome.  <i>N/A for 2006 funded grants</i>	<b>0 points</b> There is inadequate evidence for how the partnership continued when funds were no longer available.

### **3. Budget and Cost Effectiveness:**

The budget was cost effective and clearly tied to the scope and requirements of the project.

<b>Criteria</b>	<b>Meets Standard</b>	<b>Below Standard</b>
3a. Cost effectiveness	<p><b>6 points</b></p> <p>Reflects on lessons learned from the project budget, including whether adequate funds were allocated in each budget category, cost effectiveness of the project, any costs that were either overestimated or underestimated, and whether the budget overage/underage impacted the ability to support the goals and objectives of the project.</p> <p>If the previously funded project did not spend all approved funds, an explanation of why funds remained is included.</p> <p>Details must be more in depth for completed projects than those that are in progress.</p>	<p><b>0 points</b></p> <p>Reflection did not adequately address lessons learned from the project budget, including whether adequate funds were allocated in each budget category, cost effectiveness of the project, any costs that were either overestimated or underestimated, or whether the budget overage/underage impacted the ability to support the goals and objectives of the project or explanation of excess funds was not addressed (if applicable).</p>